

## SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

### MINUTES

Meeting of Thursday, November 17, 1994  
Room BC-110, 10:30

**Present:** E. Abouheif, B. Anderson, E.M. Besso, P. Bird, T. Bui (Chair), P. Dalton, D. Feldman, D. Gold, A.B. Ibrahim, P. Lightbown, K. Lipke, E. Loo (recording secretary), D. Markiewicz, J.F. Plamondon, R. Storms, C. Suen

**Regrets:** U. de Brentani

### DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED AND DISTRIBUTED TO SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

SRC-11-17-94-A Agenda for the SRC Meeting of November 17, 1994  
SRC-10-06-94-M Minutes for the SRC Meeting of October 6, 1994  
SRC-11-17-94-D1 Broadening the mandate of the Human Research Ethics Committee  
SRC-11-17-94-D2 Draft Report on Research Centres at Concordia University  
SRC-11-17-94-D3 Minutes of Senate Committee on Academic Planning & Priorities (SCAPP) Meeting of September 22, 1994  
SRC-11-17-94-D4 Minutes of Senate Committee on Academic Planning & Priorities (SCAPP) Meeting of October 20, 1994  
SRC-10-06-94-D6 University Support for Recognised Research Centres

### CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:35 a.m.

Chair welcomed Dr. D. Pushkar Gold who has agreed to sit on the committee as a member-at-large, Dr. R. Storms, a representative from the Faculty of Arts & Science and Mr. J.F. Plamondon, a graduate student representative.

Chair thanked Dr. James Jans for coming to the SRC meeting to discuss the document *Broadening the Mandate of the Human Research Ethics Committee*.

**1. Approval of Agenda (SRC-10-06-94-A)**

In order to accommodate Dr. Jans, Chair proposed to move item 7 a) Broadening the mandate of the Human Research Ethics Committee (SRC-11-17-94-D1) to item 4 thus moving items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 to a notch.

On motion by J.P. Plamondon and seconded by P. Dalton, the agenda for the meeting was approved.

**2. Approval of Minutes from the meeting of October 6, 1994.**

The Minutes for the October 6 meeting were approved.

**3. Business arising from Minutes**

Two items and both appear under Item 8 a) and b)

**4. Broadening the Mandate of the Human Research Ethics Committee**

Chair briefly mentioned about the set-up of the committee. The committee reports to the Associate Vice-Rector Academic (Research), it consists of 6 members including the Chair, one medical consultant and one legal consultant which is Me. Bram Freedman, legal counsel of the University, one secretary who is from ORS. The present mandate of the committee is restricted to reviewing those applications from faculty members seeking external funding, the new mandate will enlarge the committee's responsibility.

Dr. Jans remarked that the committee has looked at the policies that are being implemented at other Canadian universities and has done an extensive review of the current practices.

D. Markiewicz added that one of the committee's concerns was that research with human subject, whether it is done by undergraduate, graduate students, faculty members or staffs should all be considered from the point of view that we expect the same kind of ethical concerns to be active in the minds of researchers and one of the goals is that there will be uniformity across all research done with human subject.

The committee's concern was about not setting-up a system that will be unworkable or inflexible or will slow the process down. The concept that evolves the Human Research Ethic Committee is not simply to assess whether ethics concerns will be met but also to educate our community in general.

Upon motion duly moved by Dr. P. Bird and seconded by Dr. D. Markiewicz, it was unanimously approved:

**THAT the document "Broadening the Mandate of the Human Research Ethics Committee" be approved.**

Chair thanked Dr. Jans for taking the time to meet with the SRC Committee.

## **5. Report of the Chair**

Chair reported the following:

- At the end of the month he will be attending with Professor K. Lipke the National Conference on Integrity in Research and Scholarship in Toronto.
- He was invited to deliver a paper at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian School of Graduate Studies. He participated in the discussion on "*The Research Experience: The Graduate Student/Supervisor Relationship, Intellectual Property, Integrity in Research, Good Mentoring*".
- He has noticed that there is a general lack of communication between the faculty representatives and their constituencies concerning issues discussed at the SRC meetings.

## **6. Report of the Director, Office of Research Services**

E.M. Besso reported the following:

- The following awards were received: NSERC Collaborative Program Grants - Dr. Reg Storms; NSERC Strategic Grants - Dr. W. Habashi received two grants; Network Centres of Excellence - One of the New Networks funded involves G. Walker and G. Boyd.
- An FRDP Task Force was established to recommend how the internal funding should be distributed among the four elements of the FRDP programme. The work of the Task Force has been completed and the recommendations were submitted on November 10.
- The Task Force which was established to develop Policy on Contract Research is in progress, a penultimate DRAFT is scheduled to be released for limited consultation by December 5, 1994
- Research Brochure: There has been a dissatisfaction with the draft produced by the first writer engaged on the project. A new freelance writer, Jim Boothroyd has been hired.
- Joanne Beaudoin and E.M. Besso will be attending the ADARUQ meeting on November 17 & 18.
- The Posting of the Job Vacancy Notice for the Industrial Liaison Manager position went out today. The Internal deadline for applications is November 25, 1994

## **7. Question Period**

None.

**8 a) Financial Support for Recognised Research Centres (SRC-10-06-94-D6)**

Chair remarked that page 2 of the document defines the eligibility as well as how University centres can apply for this fund. There should be a mechanism to review the requests and he would like to have a small committee consisting of members of the SRC. The deadline for application is December 9 and he intends to announce the result before the new year.

The following points were observed:

- The financial support for recognised research centres is for one shot only, future funding will depend on the CASA Fund.
- The fund is mainly to support infrastructure.
- After the competition, the money not distributed will go back to the Faculties.
- At this point, inter-university centres which are housed outside Concordia will not be eligible.
- Selection Committee members should be researchers but not directors of research centres.
- Criteria that will be used:
  - Current supports for infrastructure from the University and the Centre's need for funds.
  - Centre grants from external agencies.
  - Performance of the centre, its mission and its achievement.

Chair proposed that the Associate/Vice Deans, research should be the members of the selection committee with the exception of Dr. Suen who is the Director of a research centre.

**8 b) Draft Report on Research Centres at Concordia University (SRC-11-17-94-D2)**

The Chair intends to run the document through a number of consultations: 1) discuss with this committee, 2) have a meeting with all the directors of research centres at Concordia. At the end of this consultation, he will develop a final version of this document to submit to Senate.

The following comments were made:

- The composition of the University Research Centres Committee, page 4 Recommendations 4.1, D. Gold strongly urged that the SRC member should be a centre member because in that committee there are going to be administrators with extremely broad mandates, to make sure that the committee to which centres report does have a viewpoint reflecting centres.

**8      b) Draft Report on Research Centres at Concordia University (SRC-11-17-94-D2)**

- The distinction between Senate approved research centres that are within the faculties and inter-university centres. There are two different reporting, Senate approved research centres which report to a Dean of faculty will follow a different route from others which report to the Associate Vice-Rector, Academic (Research). In the Faculty of Arts & Science, commitments are made to University centres by the University as a whole but the Dean has the problem of finding the budget and resource allocation for the centres. It was urged that this distinction be resolved and all centres report to the Associate Vice-Rector, Academic (Research).
- It was suggested that all University research centres and the support issue should be controlled through the SRC. It was commented that this will be difficult because for example course remission is under the authority of the Dean and the Chair.
- There should be very explicit mechanisms with respect to the University responsibilities to the granting agencies.
- The rights of the centres should be specified.

Chair will make the suggested changes and the document will be tabled to a future SRC meeting.

**9      For information:**

The Minutes of Senate Committee on Academic Planning & Priorities (SCAPP) Meeting of September 22, 1994 and October 20, 1994 were distributed for information.

**10     Varia**

SCAPP minutes will be circulated to the committee when there are items related to SRC and overall planning and priorities.

**11.    Adjournment**

It was moved that the meeting be adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

file:...\src\minute94.95\nov-17.094